

units; Department of the Navy, \$43,880,000 for 2,195 units; Department of the Air Force, \$69,997,000 for 3,760 units. The units for each of the services include both housing for the continental United States and overseas.

No specific projects are deleted from the housing program, but funds have been made available only for the 7,500 units mentioned above. The Department of Defense and the services are charged with the responsibility of selecting where the housing units will be constructed on the basis of priority and need within the services.

I point this out in the Record because Senators may receive many inquiries about what was done with reference to housing units which had been requested in their respective States. Individual Senators and Members of the House ought not to be charged with the responsibility of getting the housing after it has been requested by the Department of Defense. That adds to the confusion, and it adds to the multiplication of so-called issues which are not pertinent or relevant. These decisions should not be made on that basis. We were willing to allow 7,500 units of housing to be built this year, but we did not

disturb the list except to reduce the money. That leaves the Department of Defense and the services charged with the responsibility of selecting where the housing units shall be constructed, on the basis of priority and need within the services. That is a legislative direction and mandate, as far as it can be carried out in language of this kind. They are charged with the responsibility of establishing the priority list in keeping with the needs of the services.

Under the section, "Department of Defense Family Housing Management Account," the conference committee adopted language placing a limitation upon the amounts of money which can be spent by the services for the construction, operation and maintenance, and debt payments for family housing within each specific service. There is some flexibility, however, given to the Secretary of Defense for the transfer of operation and maintenance appropriations.

Mr. President, I feel that the committee on conference has worked out a very fair and equitable bill. Further, it is my opinion that the bill furnishes for the Department of Defense and the services all the funds necessary to carry

out the construction program required for our national defense commitments; and further, that the total reduction of \$275,615,000 from the amount requested by the Department of Defense and the Budget Bureau does not cut into, nor in any way weaken the bone and muscle of our military program.

I believe this bill establishes the fact that there can be some economy and that there can be some reductions with reference to military expenditures. The Senator from Mississippi believes that we have reached a critical place in our total budget of what our economy can stand, when more effective attention must be given to these military programs. We must never deny any sum that is essential. At the same time we must be certain that it is essential, and that only the essential amount of the request is allowed.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at this point certain tables which show the estimates and allowances with reference to the program.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appropriations for military construction, fiscal year 1963, showing 1962 appropriations, 1963 estimates, and congressional action

Item (1)	Appropriations, 1962 (2)	Budget estimates (revised), 1963 (3)	House bill (4)	Senate bill (5)	Conference action (6)	Increase (+) or decrease (-), conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimates, 1963 (7)	House bill (8)	Senate bill (9)
Defense.....	\$27,000,000	\$234,421,500	\$197,477,500	\$193,634,000	\$181,272,000	-\$53,149,500	-\$16,205,500	-\$12,362,000
Military construction, Army.....	157,934,000	306,802,000	214,349,500	196,423,000	193,355,000	-113,507,000	-20,994,500	-3,068,000
Military construction, Navy.....	192,278,000	944,445,000	808,722,000	860,782,000	847,810,500	-96,635,500	-15,911,500	-12,971,500
Military construction, Air Force.....	498,346,000	45,000,000	33,192,000	38,662,000	35,677,000	-10,323,000	+2,485,000	-2,955,000
Military construction, Defense agencies.....	10,000,000	22,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-2,000,000		
Loran station, Defense.....	14,381,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000			
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	4,005,000	6,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....								
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	21,868,750	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
Military construction, Air Guard.....	18,275,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000			
Total.....	951,690,750	1,594,729,500	1,369,741,000	1,350,501,000	1,319,114,500	-275,615,000	-50,626,500	-31,386,500

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to agree to the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 5.

The motion was agreed to.

THE U-2 INCIDENT IN RED CHINA— THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the course of the President's press conference yesterday evening, he referred to the U-2 incident occurring over Red China. I do not know whether the President was indulging in politics, or whether he was merely stating a fact. However, he is reported as having said that the plane that was recently shot down by the Red Chinese had been sold to the Nationalist Chinese in July 1960, during the Eisenhower administration.

I do not know why he should mention that point, except to mention a historic fact. If politics was involved, I see no

reason for it. In that case I would remind the President that his administration has given F-100 fighter planes to Yugoslavia, which certainly is not a friend of ours. The U-2 is not a weapon-carrying airplane, whereas the F-100 is a lethal weapon.

Therefore, if politics is to be involved in the sale of a normal airplane, I think we should also consider the fact that in the President's own administration deadly weapons have been given to a country which is certainly not our friend and that, in addition, we have trained pilots from that country to use such weapons.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I heard the President's broadcast last night. I believe the President used the date 1960, but did not make reference to the Eisenhower administration. The name "Eisenhower" was not used in the press conference.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not hear the broadcast. I merely read an article referring to it in this morning's paper. The article states that the sale was arranged in 1960 "that is, during the Eisenhower administration." The headline reads: "Kennedy Pins U-2 Sales On Eisenhower Regime."

I hope the Senator from Michigan is correct. Knowing the newspaper, I am inclined to think that it was the newspaper which made the statement, and not the President.

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe the Senator will find that the Eisenhower regime was not referred to in the press conference. I know the Senator from Arizona wants to be correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I certainly do. I do not think politics should be involved in a situation like this. If it was the fault of the newspaper, I expect it to print a retraction of the story tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

September 14

18424

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON CUBA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last night the President began his press conference with a statement on Cuba. It is a sober statement which makes clear his complete command of the realities of that situation. It is a statement replete with firmness and wisdom and responsibility. He has the courage to say we will act as our needs may require. He has the courage equally to say that we will not act in an irresponsible fashion out of an irrational fear, or an excess of brashness, or merely out of an understandable but vague desire to "do something."

Mr. President, the Senate might well note the President's words on Cuba. They provide an excellent framework for the consideration of a resolution which will be helpful to him in this situation. I am confident that beyond considerations of partisanship, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, who will consider such a resolution during the next few days, will have as their fundamental impulse a desire to close ranks in support of the President. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is the transcript of President Kennedy's news conference yesterday in Washington, as recorded by the New York Times:

I have a preliminary statement.

There has been a great deal of talk on the situation in Cuba in recent days, both in the Communist camp and in our own, and I would like to take this opportunity to set the matter in perspective.

In the first place it is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin American countries.

He has been condemned by the OAS (Organization of American States), excluded from the Inter-American Defense Board and kept out of the Free Trade Association. By his own monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with him, his economy has crumbled and his pledges for economic progress have been discarded.

Along with his pledges for political freedom his industries are stagnating, his harvests are declining, his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed. So it is not surprising that in a frantic effort to bolster his regime he should try to arouse the Cuban people by charges of an imminent American invasion and commit himself still further to a Soviet takeover in the hope of preventing his own collapse.

REPEATS CONCLUSION

Ever since communism moved into Cuba in 1958, Soviet technical and military personnel have moved steadily on to the island in increasing numbers at the invitation of the Cuban Government.

Now that movement has been increased. It is under our most careful surveillance.

But I will repeat the conclusion that I reported last week: that these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere.

If the United States ever should find it necessary to take military action against communism in Cuba, all of Castro's Communist-supplied weapons and technicians will not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve that result.

However, unilateral military intervention on the part of the United States cannot currently be either required or justified, and it is regrettable that loose talk about such action in this country might serve to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat exists.

But let me make this clear once again. If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities in Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

We shall be alert to and fully capable of dealing swiftly with any such development. As President and Commander in Chief, I have fully authority now to take such action. And I have asked the Congress to authorize me to call up Reserve forces should this, or any other crisis, make it necessary.

In the meantime, we intend to do everything within our power to prevent such a threat from coming into existence.

Our friends in Latin America must realize the consequences such developments hold out for their own peace and freedom, and we shall be making further proposals to them.

Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their ships' engaging in the Cuban trade. We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom.

We shall continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed. We shall increase our surveillance of the whole Caribbean area. We shall neither initiate nor permit aggression in this hemisphere.

With this in mind, while I recognize that rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those who do not have the responsibility, I would hope that the future record will show that the only people talking about a war or an invasion at this time are the Communist spokesmen in Moscow and Havana, and that the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at the present time a bill to establish a new Government agency to be called the Freedom Academy lies before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In the press there has been a great deal of comment to the effect that efforts may be made to have this bill, S. 822, passed before the adjournment of the present session of this Congress.

So far as I am concerned, the Nation would be better off if the proposed legislation had a quiet demise in the committee to which it has been assigned. If there is one thing we do not need it is another governmental agency to rove the field of foreign policy.

The purpose of the proposed Freedom Academy is to prescribe doctrines by which the United States and friendly nations are to conduct the cold war. It is proposed that a school similar to our service academies be created to develop a scientific method of combating communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science. Of course all of that would be done at considerable expense to our taxpayers. The proposed academy is supposed to be an answer to similar Soviet schools training commissars to serve as political advisers to Soviet military, air, and naval units and foreign Communists in the techniques of subversion; and it is alleged that the proposed Freedom Academy would find answers to the many-faceted problems of the cold war.

Mr. President, do we really desire to ape Communist Russia and to have political commissars attached to units of our Armed Forces? Americans are intelligent; they are not unintelligent cattle to be herded and regimented.

This is an outrageous proposal—to create a so-called Freedom Academy, and to spend millions of the taxpayers' dollars on such a project.

In our struggle with international communism—and it is a serious struggle, indeed, Mr. President—we must employ not only our military strength, but also all of our political, psychological, and economic resources as well. However, the issue is whether the so-called Freedom Academy is necessary or desirable in that connection. Someone conceived the name "Freedom Academy"; and, Mr. President, the fact is that the only attraction of this proposal lies in its name. If bad legislation is proposed, but if it is given an attractive name such as "Freedom Academy," in some minds the proposal becomes a meritorious one. However, Mr. President, this measure is not a meritorious proposal. The struggle with the international Communist conspiracy involves infinitely complex problems. We live in a grim period of international anarchy. The menace posed by the aggressive and ruthless dic-

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18425

tators of the Soviet Union and Red China is the most serious our Nation has faced in its history. As leader of the free world we must retain our armed might and strengthen our retaliatory capability in order to assure that the Communist dictators will never dare to embark on a war of conquest. However, it seems to me to be only wishful thinking to believe that a new governmental agency, without operational responsibility, would be able to cope with the grave and complex problems involved in this effort.

I suggest that we would be seriously deluding ourselves if we were to believe that the strategy for waging the fight against communism could be formulated into an operational science. Too many imponderables, too many unknown factors, and too many human elements are involved.

Intensive research into the nature and technique of the Communist conspiracy is necessary. Our intelligence personnel do make and, of course, should continue that policy of complete surveillance and inquiry into the operations of Communist Russia and Red China. They have been, I am certain, and will continue to be, alert and to keep abreast of these activities and try to figure the operations and contemplated moves of our potential enemies.

Existing Government agencies have accomplished much in this area, and will continue to do so. Those who carry out current programs run up against the practical problems of fighting communism. The proposed Freedom Academy would have relatively little practical contact with these problems. There is no sense in duplicating these efforts by establishing another agency to spend taxpayers' money. Furthermore, to assign this vital function to the proposed Freedom Academy would be like using a jeep to do a bulldozer's job.

The State Department has been given the primary role in marshaling our non-military resources in the cold war. Its Foreign Service Institute is developing a considerable program on anti-Communist techniques, of which an important part was implemented on June 11th. Plans are also underway to expand significantly the Foreign Service Institute and broaden its training responsibilities to meet the needs of the changing times. During the last 5 years, 2,750 students from many governmental agencies attended seminars conducted by the Institute on Communist methods and organization.

In addition, educational opportunities are available at any one of the excellent Russian research or international studies centers throughout the country. A few years ago Soviet and Chinese Communist specialization was available at only three or four universities. Now 25 colleges and universities offer such specialization. Incidentally, many foreign students are educated on our views regarding communism, directly and indirectly, through student exchange programs. Also, such programs as the Peace Corps contribute to international understanding of Communist subversion.

Furthermore, the Justice Department operates a number of anti-Communist schools whose courses include instruction on Communist theory and policy. The Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Information Agency, and security agencies in various other Government departments analyze problems of communism and teach civilian and military personnel about them in the same way that officials of the Freedom Academy, so-called, would, were we to be foolish enough to enact that legislative proposal into law.

Proponents of the Freedom Academy insist that it would bring this widespread activity together and coordinate it, thereby making it more effective. The facts are that if the State, Defense, and Justice Departments gave up their anti-Communist programs to the Freedom Academy, they would be crippled in many of their other related operations. If the Departments retained these functions, it is obvious that the Freedom Academy would be duplicating them; and adding one more voice to a chorus will not make it more harmonious. As current programs stand, diversity is useful because of the variety of methods employed in the cold war struggle. There is much coordination and communication between the agencies involved in this work.

Mr. President, it is extremely doubtful that governments of many countries or public opinion abroad would support the idea of enrolling foreigners—nationals of those countries—in this Academy for work to be done in their home countries. Such things are by their very nature done secretly, if at all. The Russians do not advertise the fact that foreign Communists in the Soviet Union are being taught Communist techniques of organization and subversion. Soviet propaganda would herald the Freedom Academy as a "cold war institute," a training course for espionage, and would give a completely incorrect connotation to the world of our concept of "freedom."

Officials of both our State Department and Department of Justice oppose this bill and urge its defeat. In my judgment it is entirely lacking in merit. I know of no governmental department that favors it. Its supporters have estimated that by the third year of operation it would cost taxpayers at least \$35 million a year.

Some have said, "Only \$35 million." I was born and reared in the country in Ohio, and to me \$35 million a year is a stupendous amount of money. At any rate, this is undoubtedly a gross underestimate. We all know of the operation of Parkinson's law and how Government agencies somehow always have a way of costing taxpayers a great deal more money than was anticipated at the time of their establishment.

The Freedom Academy, so called, has all the hallmarks of becoming another multimillion-dollar bureaucratic boondoggle, were it to be enacted into law. Far from being an aid in the cold war struggle, it would result only in duplication of effort and a waste of taxpayers' money. It is my fervent hope that our

colleagues in the foreign relations committee will take no action on this bill during this session or any other session of Congress. Let it continue to lie in a state of innocuous desuetude.

Finally, Mr. President, it is a fact that the U.S. Government maintains and has maintained over the years four freedom academies which are the greatest institutions of their kind anywhere in the world. I refer to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, and the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London. It would seem to me unthinkable that we should give consideration to giving in to the proponents of this so-called Freedom Academy, and I am speaking out against such an outrageously foolish proposal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FILING OF A COMMITTEE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to file a report during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is hoped and anticipated that the trade bill will be ready for action on Monday, and that the report and hearings will be available, because both go together. I make this announcement so that Senators may be aware of the intention of the leadership.

September 14

THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS
CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a transcript of the news conference held by President Kennedy yesterday, September 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The transcript of the news conference was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC MATTERS

Thank you.

I have a preliminary statement.

There has been a great deal of talk on the situation in Cuba in recent days, both in the Communist camp and in our own, and I would like to take this opportunity to set the matter in perspective.

In the first place it is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin-American countries.

He has been condemned by the OAS (Organization of American States) excluded from the Inter-American Defense Board and kept out of the Free Trade Association. By his own monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with him, his economy has crumbled and his pledges for economic progress have been discarded.

Along with his pledges for political freedom his industries are stagnating, his harvests are declining, his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed. So it is not surprising that in a frantic effort to bolster his regime he should try to arouse the Cuban people by charges of an imminent American invasion and commit himself still further to a Soviet takeover in the hope of preventing his own collapse.

REPEATS CONCLUSION

Ever since communism moved into Cuba in 1958, Soviet technical and military personnel have moved steadily on to the island in increasing numbers at the invitation of the Cuban Government.

Now that movement has been increased. It is under our most careful surveillance.

But I will repeat the conclusion that I reported last week: that these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere.

If the United States ever should find it necessary to take military action against communism in Cuba, all of Castro's Communist-supplied weapons and technicians will not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve that result.

However, unilateral military intervention on the part of the United States cannot currently be either required or justified, and it is regrettable that loose talk about such action in this country might serve to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat exists.

But let me make this clear once again. If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities in Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to pro-

test its own security and that of its allies.

We shall be alert to and fully capable of dealing swiftly with any such development. As President and Commander in Chief, I have full authority now to take such action. And I have asked the Congress to authorize me to call up Reserve forces should this, or any other crisis, make it necessary.

In the meantime, we intend to do everything within our power to prevent such a threat from coming into existence.

Our friends in Latin America must realize the consequences such developments hold out for their own peace and freedom, and we shall be making further proposals to them.

Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their ships engaging in the Cuban trade. We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom.

We shall continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed. We shall increase our surveillance of the whole Caribbean area. We shall neither initiate nor permit aggression in this hemisphere.

With this in mind, while I recognize that rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those who do not have the responsibility, I would hope that the future record will show that the only people talking about a war or an invasion at this time are the Communist spokesmen in Moscow and Havana, and that the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head.

OFFENSIVE THREAT IN CUBA

1

Question. Mr. President, coupling this statement with the one of last week, at what point do you determine that the buildup in Cuba has lost its defensive guise to become offensive? Would it take an overt act?

Answer. I think if you read last week's statement and the statement today—I've made it quite clear, particularly in last week's statement when we talked about the presence of offensive military missile capacity or development of military bases * * * would indicate a change in the nature of the threat.

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE

2

Question. Mr. President, in this same line, do you—have you set for yourself any rule or set of conditions at which you will determine the existence of an offensive rather than a defensive force in Cuba? And in that same connection, in your reading of the Monroe Doctrine what do you—how do you define intervention? Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force, in this hemisphere amount to contravention of the doctrine?

Answer. Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive actions against the United States, the United States would act. I've also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere.

The United States will make appropriate military judgments after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, after carefully analyzing whatever new information comes in as to whether that point has been reached where an offensive threat does exist. And at that time the country, the Congress, will be so notified.

EXPORTS OF U-2 AIRCRAFT

3

Question. Mr. President. Mr. President, would you state, sir, whether or not the

United States has given export licenses for the export of U-2 aircraft to other nations, other than Nationalist China? And, if so, what is our policy?

Answer. No, we have not. We have not. These export licenses were given in—as you know, in July 1960, and were sold to the Nationalist Chinese Government. We have no plans to sell any further ones or to grant any export licenses.

BERLIN AND THE ELECTIONS

4

Question. Mr. President.

Answer. Yes.

Question. Would you comment, on the Soviet announcement that they apparently will shelve discussion on Berlin until after our elections in November.

Answer. I thought that the leaders of both political parties in the Congress indicated very clearly that on this matter of Berlin there was not a political division within the United States, and that our position would not be—in Berlin, which carries over a long commitment stretching back for many years and several administrations—would not be affected by whatever the results may be in the November election.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

5

Question. Mr. President, could you tell us why the Alliance for Progress has not made more progress in the past year on Latin American problems in your judgment?

Answer. Well, the Alliance for Progress is a tremendous effort which is to, by the united effort of the free countries of Latin America and the United States, to attempt to bring about an increase in the standard of living in the opportunities for the people of Latin America.

Latin America has been neglected for many, many years. I would hope that a good many Americans, who are particularly concerned about Cuba today, would also take a very careful look at the very low standard of living of much of Latin America, the bad housing, the unemployment, the bad health of so many of the people there.

We're engaged in a monumental task in attempting to increase the standard of living of the people of Latin America and we're—have available for that purpose a good many less—a good deal less money than we had available for the rebuilding of Lat—of Europe, which had a highly developed labor force, great technical skills and which required only an infusion to provide an increase over the prewar standard of living.

Here we do not have the technical skills. We do not have the planning staff. We have, in a sense, neglected Latin America, so that we are engaged in a tremendous operation with insufficient resources. And I think we are moving ahead since Punta del Este. But there's an awful lot of business left unfinished, and will be for some time. You cannot remake the face of Latin America overnight and provide better opportunity.

In addition, I'm very anxious that the countries of Western Europe, particularly the Common Market, will concern themselves with Latin America. Latin America depends on its export markets to Europe in order to maintain its economy.

Latin America has had a flight of capital in recent months which has been serious. In addition, the price of its primary products has also dropped in recent months. So that even the assistance we have given has not been enough to keep Latin America even, and particularly when its population increase amounts to almost 3 percent.

So we're faced with staggering problems in Latin America, and I hope that in our concentration on the particular problem which I discussed at the opening we will extend our view and realize that what's at stake here is the freedom of a good many countries which are in very dire straits today.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19253

never try to hoodwink the Congress as to their progress or lack of progress, and that they carry out to the best of their ability the sense of Congress as expressed in adopted legislation and legislative histories.

At the same time, I am keenly aware of the manifold pressures on every high administration official—pressures which make intolerable the burden of testifying for hours on end to different committees and subcommittees about basically similar pieces of legislation. Each committee has a natural desire to hear the views of the most authoritative Cabinet or sub-Cabinet officer concerning bills of immense complexity and importance. Yet in practice this means that Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of Commerce Hodges, and other outstanding Cabinet members in many instances have to give more time to Congress than they give to their own Departments.

As one means of improving this inefficient procedure, I have informally suggested that the Senate adopt the practice of inviting senior Cabinet officials to appear before it and answer questions from the floor concerning specific legislation, general problems of policy and administration, and the operation of their Departments. Such a "question period" would give the whole Senate an opportunity to direct questions at individual Cabinet members without haling them before one committee after another to the detriment to their health and efficiency. A question period—say, once a week during the session of Congress—would improve relations and mutual understanding between Congress and the executive branch. It would have a marked beneficial effect upon the conduct of our foreign relations.

Naturally any idea of this kind has to be investigated thoroughly. Cogent objections to a question period in the Senate have appeared in the daily press. Most objections center around the incompatibility of the parliamentary system with the Presidential system as we practice it here in the United States. The purpose of a question period would be not defeated even if it did not result in a substantial reduction of required committee appearances for Cabinet officers.

It could and would provide for the separate Houses of the Congress a vital and needed contact with the senior officers of the Government.

I am giving considerable thought to the mechanics of implementing this suggestion, however, and if certain problems can be resolved to my satisfaction, I shall introduce a resolution enabling members of the administration to appear before the Senate, which would sit as a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of interrogation.

A question period, however, only partially disposes of the problem of improving liaison between the State Department and the general public. Alan Otten puts his finger on the problem when he states that the State Department "lacks a readily identifiable, politi-

cally powerful constituency in the United States." Perhaps such a constituency cannot be created under existing conditions, but much more could be done to marshal the support of U.S. citizens for the basic objectives of our foreign policy. Much more should be done simply to inform the American public. Too many people honestly believe, I regret to say, that the President of the United States has shown weakness by submitting a plan for disarmament and arms control to an international conference. I wish that the American public had a change to see for themselves that U.S. foreign policy is deeply patriotic and is keyed to the ultimate interests of the United States.

To a heartening extent the State Department has recognized its responsibility to the American public. Its officials no longer hesitate to leave Foggy Bottom for speeches to regional foreign policy conferences, schools, civic groups, and other organizations. Editors, broadcasters, newsmen, and educators attend background seminars conducted by the Department in Washington and elsewhere. The Department has a lengthening mailing list of speeches and pamphlets to organizations and individuals around the country.

Progress of this sort is encouraging. It is limited, however, by lack of funds and by the resistance of certain powerful figures on Capitol Hill who are stubbornly opposed to activities designed to improve its image with the public and enhance its effectiveness in the Federal system.

Mr. President, I have had the privilege of corresponding with several prominent and respected members of this administration concerning the absence of grassroots support for the State Department. I wish to give full credit to Mr. Pierce Butler III, of St. Paul, Minn., for again stimulating my interest in this problem. Pierce Butler, incidentally a lifelong Republican, suggests that small towns and rural areas, as well as the larger urban centers, be given an opportunity for the broadest possible discussion of foreign policy problems. In these outlying areas there is undoubtedly much untapped interest in American foreign policy. What is needed is a concentrated effort to stimulate informed discussion of our country's role in the world of today. One excellent suggestion for better informing the American public would be to hold organized foreign affairs discussions—say, on the campus of State teachers' colleges or at a centrally located county seat—which would be attended by Washington officials at the highest possible level. The thought behind this suggestion is welcomed by the State Department and other key administration officials. It deserves the specific approval of Congress. One thing is clear; we need a "foreign affairs constituency" and we need to create it in the very areas which breed the most destructive criticism of our foreign policy. An initiative in this direction would help forge a new frontier of understanding and enlightenment for all Americans.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal]

WOOLING CONGRESS—THE STATE DEPARTMENT DRIVES TO OVERCOME LAWMAKERS' HOSTILITY—OFFICIALS STEP UP CONTACTS TO EXPLAIN POLICIES, SEEK TO CURB DIPLOMATS' DISDAIN—CONGRESSMEN ARE NOT BOOBS

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy State Department is out to woo an important but frequently hostile power: The U.S. Congress.

While other Federal Departments face occasional trouble on Capitol Hill, the State Department is in chronic difficulties; it's a perennial target, a favorite whipping boy. Of late, the relationship has seemed even icier than usual.

Half a dozen bitter battles had to be fought before the foreign aid authorization bill could become law; the actual appropriation, still to come, will certainly be cut deeply below the President's request. The United Nations bond purchase plan, after a stormy Senate passage, has House Democratic leaders worried and on edge. The State Department's own appropriations request has just been sliced better than 15 percent in the House, amid thunderous criticism. Almost daily the Senate and House Chambers resound with attacks on the Department's policies and actions in Berlin, Laos, Latin America, the Middle East, and other world trouble spots.

To repair the damage, Department officials from Secretary Rusk on down are resorting to an unlikely mixture of diplomatic wiles and domestic political techniques.

CHANGING STEREOTYPED THINKING

"Our problem," says a top State Department official, "is to change attitudes and stereotyped thinking on both sides of the relationship. We must make Congress think better of the Department, and we must make the Department think better of Congress."

Secretary Rusk, having devoted most of last year to getting better acquainted with his foreign counterparts, is now cultivating Congress. So far this year over 40 Senators and 100 House Members of both parties have come in groups of 8 or 9 for breakfast or lunch at the State Department; Mr. Rusk usually hits the high spots of U.S. foreign policy problems and then answers questions. Though the soft-spoken Secretary usually comes through poorly in formal speeches or TV appearances, Congressmen agree that he seems well-informed, frank, and firm in these private sessions.

About once a week, Mr. Rusk takes small groups of Congressmen out for an evening sail on the President's yacht, and here social small talk prevails unless some Congressman switches to a weightier topic. Under Secretaries Ball and McGhee have also done some mealtime proselyting at the State Department, while Fowler Hamilton, boss of the Agency for International Development (AID), has had key lawmakers at his home for small breakfast or dinner gatherings. Mr. Hamilton has personally called so far this session on about 150 House Members and 50 Senators in their Capitol Hill offices for 30- to 45-minute chats on his plans and problems in foreign aid; the day before the House voted on the foreign aid bill, Mr. Hamilton got around to chat with 26 Members.

MORE BRIEFING SESSIONS

In August the Department plans to resume once-a-week briefing sessions on Capitol Hill for Members generally. In April, the Department tried to attract Congressmen each Wednesday at 5 p.m. to hear one or another assistant secretary discuss current problems in his geographic area—Averell Harriman on the Far East, G. Mennen Williams on Africa, Foy Kohler on Europe, and so on. But

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 21

19254

turnout was tiny, with absent Members citing the need to be on the floor or in their offices signing mail at that hour. The August series will be at 9 in the morning, and the Department hopes for a better response.

The Department has also held one general briefing session on the Hill for committee officials and administrative assistants of Senators and Congressmen, and hopes for another one or two before adjournment. Mass mailings now provide lawmakers with key speeches of State Department officials, background material on such topics as the "Sino-Soviet Rift" or "The U.N. Bond Issue," and even some secret administration studies in the foreign policy field.

State Department men are trying to give lawmakers faster and more informative answers to their written questions on foreign policy. Assistant Secretary of State Frederick Dutton, former White House aid now in charge of the Department's congressional liaison, reports he now sends back for better answers over one-third of all Department replies of congressional mail queries.

Officials are trying to make public many arguments previously advanced only in private. During the House foreign aid debate the Department did not rely just on its old line that aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Poland "encourages them to pursue their national interest." Instead, its friends in the House were permitted to point out that Poland and Yugoslavia do not jam Voice of America broadcasts, that American and West European papers and magazines are sold there, that English has replaced Russian as the most widely taught foreign language in Yugoslavia, that 72 percent of Yugoslav trade is now tied to the West. Before, the Department had tried to soft-pedal these ideas for fear public mention would provoke the Polish and Yugoslav Governments into reversing the situation.

DISSIPATING DISTRUST

Within the Department, officials are trying to dissipate career diplomats' longstanding distrust and even disdain for Congress, an attitude that causes or aggravates many of the Department's difficulties on Capitol Hill. "The average Foreign Service officer regards us as the great unwashed a bunch of clowns," says a Democratic Senator who strongly supports the Department on almost every issue. Partly this distrust seems to be almost inbred; partly it reflected the habits of speaking the indirect language of diplomacy. "We're taught from the beginning to keep things quiet while people can work on them behind the scenes," a Foreign Service officer explains.

President Kennedy, in a recent talk to Foreign Service officers, reminded them that "every Member of Congress who subjects you to abuse is being subjected himself, every 2 years, to the possibility that his career will come to an end. . . . you have to remember that the hot breath is on him also."

CONGRESSMEN ARE NOT BOOBS

Deputy AID Administrator Frank Coffin, a former Democratic House Member, last week read a stern lecture to a private meeting of the AID executive staff. "Congressmen are not boobs," he declared. "They can tell if someone is being contemptuous, and they're going to hit back. Unless you have the attitude that these men are intelligent and responsible, you're going to be in deep trouble."

Mr. Dutton last month arranged to have Democratic Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and FELL, of Rhode Island, plus Republican Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, speak to senior Foreign Service officers on their complaints against the Department and suggestions for doing better; Mr. HICKENLOOPER, for example, complained that Department witnesses before Congress were frequently in-

formed and unable to explain policies in commonsense terms. Mr. Dutton has another session set up in August for junior Foreign Service officers, where Members of Congress and staff aids will try to convey some feeling of the political problems facing Congress in the foreign policy field.

Obviously some of the Department's most vexing vicissitudes stem from its policies, not its presentation of them. Lots of Congressmen and lots of citizens at large just don't like areas, and don't hesitate to say so. But the Department's whipping-boy role has persisted under Democrats and Republicans alike, under Secretaries reckoned "soft on communism" and under Secretaries reckoned "tough."

Other troubles are inherent in the department's position in the governmental scheme. It lacks a readily identifiable, politically powerful constituency in the United States. No large, vocal organizations take arms against its foes the way certain farm organizations battle for the Agriculture Department. The State Department lacks the patronage and other political favors other departments can muster to reward or penalize lawmakers. It has few jobs and contracts to hand out.

PLEADING FOREIGNERS' CAUSES

By its very function, the Department must advance the interests of foreigners. To maintain friends abroad, officials feel they must often speak out for the French business firm against the Illinois firm, for the Australian farmer against the Kansas farmer. "Considering how unpopular many of its positions are on the surface, it's amazing the Department ever gets anything at all through Congress," asserts a friendly Democratic Senator from the Midwest.

"When a Senator's mail is giving him hell for everything he's been doing, and he feels he's in trouble back home, he comes to the floor and lets fly at the State Department," an internationalist-minded Republican Senator observes. "It's the safest way to let off steam."

Declares a northern Democratic House Member who works for many department bills: "Every guy up here feels he owes himself one or two demagogic stands a year, for back-home consumption. The State Department just happens to be the safest thing to demagogue against."

Mr. Rusk, his top lieutenants, and their congressional cohorts see only one way to overcome the most basic handicaps: Long-term and constant "education" of the public on the hows and whys of U.S. foreign policy. "The entire administration," says one southern Democratic Congressman, "must do more to sell foreign policy in general and particular bills, too, until Members no longer feel they have to prove their anticommunism by automatically voting against the State Department."

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Many believe the selling job must be led by the President himself, with frequent radio-television addresses, and with the support of other administration speakers and private organizations. "This year's tariff bill was a classic job of a long, careful education campaign paying off," a White House official asserts. "Many other foreign policy bills should be handled the same way." Declares a Democratic Senator from the Midwest: "The infantry up here can fight the battles on medicare and farm legislation and public works, the ones that have clear political impact back home. Where we need Presidential air cover is on those foreign policy votes—those are the ones we get failed on."

Department officials already are making more and more speeches to schools, civic groups, and other organizations all across the land. They've held special "background"

seminars for editors and broadcasters in Washington and for newsmen and educators in other cities. There's an ever-lengthening mailing list of organizations and individuals receiving copies of the Department's speeches and pamphlets.

Recently a daily "orientation" lecture was begun for out-of-town tourists in Washington. Top officials often make themselves available for interviews by lawmakers taping radio or TV shows for hometown consumption. Mr. Dutton's office now supplies close to 200 Congressmen with a monthly collection of "human interest" jottings that can be worked into newsletters going back home. The squibs range from a chatty report on Fourth of July festivities at overseas embassies to a rundown of stamps issued in honor of the World Health Organization's fight against malaria.

Press releases now emphasize the domestic business that will result from U.S. foreign aid. "Eighty-seven million will be spent by Pakistan for American industrial products under terms of two loans authorized today by the Agency for International Development," the AID recently announced.

But there are real limits on how much "education" the Department can do. While some of its friends on Capitol Hill urge more, many other lawmakers urge much less. The Department's public affairs division has been a favorite target of the House Appropriations Committee's economy ax.

"The job of the State Department is to carry on foreign relations, not to get in the newspapers," declares Representative ROONEY, the Brooklyn Democrat who heads the Appropriations Subcommittee handling State Department funds. Adds Representative BOW, of Ohio, top Republican on the subcommittee, "the way for the Department to improve its relations with Congress is to cut out all its propaganda and lobbying."

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A CENTURY OF FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if I am not mistaken, tomorrow is Emancipation Day. It is the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. On June 14 I introduced a Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 200) to establish a Century of Freedom Commission to develop plans for commemorating this coming year the 100th anniversary of the signing of one of the most significant documents of human progress in the annals of history.

That resolution provided for the establishment of a Century of Freedom Commission to be composed of 30 persons, including the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall all 3 serve as ex officio members of the Commission; 3 Members from the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House; 3 Members of the U.S. Senate appointed by the President of the Senate; 20 members to be appointed by the President of the United States; and 1 member from the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service or his representative.

The functions of the Commission would be to develop and execute suitable plans for commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

One of the darkest chapters in world history was the enslavement and forced deportation of Negro men, women, and children. As our Secretary of State Dean Rusk said only recently at a dinner in honor of the President of the Ivory Coast, Felix Houphouet-Boigny, the United States can take no pride in regard to the manner in which Africans came to this country, but we can be proud of the contributions which Africans and their descendants have made to the United States.

Certainly the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 was one of the most noble acts of government in the history of mankind. And the faith which Abraham Lincoln had in the Negro people has been confirmed by the contribution which they have made, against great odds, to our country.

I would hope, Mr. President, that this Century of Freedom Commission would among other things direct its attention to acquainting the public with the impressive accomplishments that American Negroes have made these past 100 years. It is an impressive record. It is a record in which we can all take pride. It is a record of accomplishment which deserves more attention than has been given. The Commission could perform a most valuable and important public service by focusing public attention on these accomplishments of the Negro people of America.

What appears to me even more important is the fact that there are huge areas of the world today that are now once again enslaved. What our world needs more than anything else is a worldwide emancipation proclamation that can be as effective as the one that Abraham Lincoln gave to the American people emancipating the American Negro in 1863, a proclamation that was prepared and written in 1862.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 200) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. J. Res. 200

Joint resolution to establish a Century of Freedom Commission

Whereas the year 1963 will mark the one-hundredth anniversary of Emancipation Proclamation which gave freedom from slavery to four million men, women, and children; and

Whereas the number of Negroes now living in these United States is in excess of nineteen million; and

Whereas the Negro race has shaken off the intangible fetters of circumstance and contributed greatly to the growth of America and given prestige to its cultural customs and mores; and

Whereas the Negro has readily and unflinchingly taken up arms to defend American democracy in every war since Crispus Attucks died a martyr for freedom in the Boston Massacre; and

Whereas the Negro has constantly demonstrated his dedication to the American spirit of freedom by serving in key educational, military and governmental posts; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the ideals and accomplishments of the Negro race be reemphasized and given wider public knowledge on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of its freedom; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as a nation to provide for the proper observance of this American event which has been and continues to be a vital force in our history: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to provide for appropriate and nationwide observances and the coordination of ceremonies, there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the "Century of Freedom Commission" (hereafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of thirty members as follows:

(1) The President of the United States, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be ex officio members of the Commission;

(2) Three members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) Three members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(4) Twenty members to be appointed by the President of the United States; and

(5) One member from the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service or his representative.

(b) The Director of the National Park Service shall call the first meeting for the purpose of electing a Chairman. The Commission, at its discretion, may appoint honorary members, and may establish an Advisory Council to assist in its work.

(c) Appointment provided for in this section, with the exception of honorary members, shall be made within a period of ninety days from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, except that vacancies may be filled after such period. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made.

SEC. 2. The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and execute suitable plans for commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. In developing such plans, the Commission shall give due consideration to any similar and related plans advanced by State, civic, patriotic, hereditary, and historical bodies, and may designate special committees with representation from the above-mentioned bodies to plan and conduct specific ceremonies. The Commission may give suitable recognition by the award of medals and certificates or by any other appropriate means to persons and organizations for outstanding achievements in preserving the culture and ideals of the Negro, or historical locations connected with his life.

SEC. 3. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting all the people of the United States to participate in and observe the centennial anniversary of the historical event, the commemoration of which is provided for herein.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with State, civic, patriotic, hereditary, and historical groups and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice.

(b) The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, expend in furtherance of this joint resolution funds donated or funds received in pursuance of contracts hereunder, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purpose of this joint resolution.

(c) The National Park Service is designated to provide all general administrative services for the Commission.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may employ, without regard to civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, an executive director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions. The annual rate of compensation of the executive director shall not exceed the scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS-13 in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the Executive Director of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account for all funds received by the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the President, not later than September 1, 1962, a report presenting the preliminary plans developed by it pursuant to this joint resolution. A final report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be made to the Congress and the President by the Commission not later than December 31, 1964, upon which date the Commission shall terminate.

(d) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon its termination may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. The members of the Commission and of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in performing their duties.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, including an appropriation of not to exceed \$1,000,000 to prepare the preliminary and final plans and reports of the Commission described in section 5(c) of this joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention on Monday, in the morning hour or shortly thereafter, to address the Senate on the subject of Emancipation Day and its full significance, because I wish to see this particular historical event properly commemorated and celebrated in light of the contributions that our Negro citizens have made to the American community, to this great Nation, and in the light of the need for a reiteration of the principle of emancipation in the 20th century.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad that the Senator from Minnesota made the preliminary statements that he has made tonight in his discussion of the great subject of emancipation. I shall look forward to what I know will be a great speech by him on Monday.

I should like to associate myself with the Senator's remarks tonight. The American Negro still has a long way to go before he is fully emancipated. It is true that the great Emancipation Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln symbolically gave the Negro his political emancipation. But the act was only symbolical, because tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of American Negroes today are not free. They do not have the precious right to exercise what I consider to be the essentiality of political freedom; namely, the precious right to vote.

Tens upon tens of thousands of them are not economically free because they

19256

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 21

still are being held down in a form of economic slavery because when they do not have equality of job opportunities, when there is economic discrimination against them because of the color of their skin—and who will deny that that is an ugly fact in our great democracy—it follows that they do not have economic freedom. They do not have educational freedom in the United States. As a result, tens of thousands of them are being denied their rights to a free education in the United States comparable to the free education the children of white parents enjoy. Until we are willing as a people, and until our Government is insistent, as a government, that the great decision of 1954 of the U.S. Supreme Court in respect to equality of educational rights in this country should be enforced, then thousands of American Negroes will not have educational freedom.

Thus I could go down the list of the deprivations and denials to Negroes in this country of various freedoms that white people enjoy, proving my point that Negroes have a long way to go, even after many decades since the Emancipation Proclamation, to enjoy the freedom that Abraham Lincoln contemplated for them when that great historic document was penned by the incomparable Emancipation and President Abraham Lincoln. I think it is well, then, with Emancipation Day coming on, to call the attention of the American people to their shortcomings on this moral and political issue. The responsibility for the shortcomings rests—true, upon the Congress in part—but really upon the American people. It is the American people who have failed to provide full freedom to the American Negro.

The American people now have an opportunity to write a great chapter of American history in our time and make clear that they wish their representatives in Congress and in the legislative halls of the States and in the municipalities and their spokesmen on the judicial benches of America and every executive officer who deals with this problem in this Government of ours to take every step within the power of their jurisdiction to see to it that the colored people of America are granted, without further delay, full freedom in all the phases of American life.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his eloquent and factual and thoughtful remarks concerning one of the most serious problems that confronts this country and what I consider to be the main item of unfinished business in our democracy. There is no doubt about the fact that we have a long way to go as a people and as a government in fulfilling the promise of equal opportunity. The Senator is eminently correct when he cites, among other deprivations, the depriving of the right to vote, the depriving of equal opportunity of education, the depriving of equal opportunity to employment. These are but a few of the discriminations.

I do not believe that any person in public life can feel he is really fulfilling his responsibility until these wrongs have

been righted, and until these inequities have been eliminated by a sense of justice and a performance of social justice.

It is my intention to discuss this subject on Monday. I do not believe it is good enough merely to celebrate the Emancipation Proclamation at the beautiful Lincoln Memorial, with a fine address, which I know will be given by our distinguished U.S. representative to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, and with all the other fine programs that we will have tomorrow, and then feel that somehow or other we have satisfied the requirements of that great Proclamation to our people.

The Emancipation Proclamation not only meant the freeing of the slaves, but it was a charge to the American people and to the American Government to do their duty in terms of securing equal protection of laws and equal opportunity under law.

As far as I am concerned, the real test of government is not so much what it does for the majority as what it does in terms of protecting the rights of the minority, because how a minority is treated is the real measure of the conscience of the community or of a society or of a government.

The Senator from Oregon has championed the cause of equal rights and equal responsibilities and equal privileges, as well as the assignment of duties for all Americans. I believe in the days to come we will judge the accomplishment of this Nation more by what it has done in terms of providing equal opportunity than what it has done in terms of its industry, or finance or even its science.

I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, I should like to inquire what the pending business is before the Senate, so that it may be clear on the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 11880, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 21, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 273. An act for the relief of Hatch Samuel Arukian;

S. 2184. An act for the relief of Mrs. Heghine Tomassian;

S. 2208. An act for the relief of Su-Fen Chen;

S. 2760. An act for the relief of Yuj-Kan Cheuk;

S. 2768. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds thereof;

S. 3026. An act for the relief of Jeno Nagy;

S. 3475. An act to provide further for cooperation with States in administration and enforcement of certain Federal laws; and

S. 3529. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 with regard to reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
ON MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, September 24, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 21, 1962:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Sandler H. Dickson William T. Sayers
Richard E. Jaquish Walter R. Wilson

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Linton F. Angle Ronald D. Gilbert
Fred Angres James L. Snowden
Clarence L. Fortner

To be senior assistant sanitarian

Dale J. Johnson

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Howard L. McMartin
Alice M. Waterhouse

To be senior assistant sanitarian

Lee W. Smith

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Ronald F. Coene Charles H. Wentworth,
Elwyn Holtrop III
Maris Pubulis

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major

Merrill, Samuel J., O65145.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be lieutenant colonel

Benzer, John G., O19571.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Seroczynski, Helen M., N606.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, and 3292:

To be lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Benelict, Harold B. (OrdCorps), O31566.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Bowes, Donald J., Jr. (SIGC), O75511.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288: